



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,368	10/16/2000	Tracey L. Jones	1005.11	3107
53953	7590	10/03/2008	EXAMINER	
DAVIS LAW GROUP, P.C.			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
6836 BEE CAVES ROAD				
SUITE 220			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78746			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/690,368	JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10,13-18,21-26,28-32,34-38 and 40-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-10,13-18,21-26,28-32,34-38 and 40-51 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/27/08.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment received 7/7/08.
2. Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-26, 28-32, 34-38, and 40-51 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 43, 44, and 45 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-45, and 46-51 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ono in view of applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. **Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ono et al., PG Pub. No. 2004/0162842.**

In reference to dependent claim 1, Ono teaches:

'storing an electronic version of a paper, the electronic version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;

At a first location within the electronic version, detecting a reference to a second location that is exclusive of the first location, wherein the detected reference at the first location is at least one of the following, other than a computer network address' an alphanumeric character; a symbol; a term; and a phrase; and

In response to the detected reference at the first location, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference at the first location, wherein the hyperlink is selectable at a first location by a user to cause displaying of the second location on the display device instead of the first location on the display device.'

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114].

Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference.

Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Ono teaches:

Figure 13 illustrates a first and second selector associated with a first portion of the paper.

The selectors, as presently claimed, are being interpreted as the hyperlinks found within the KWIK document which are associated with different portions of the document. See figure 13.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Ono teaches:

Stretching the link by embedding a specific tag corresponding to the both documents of the abstract document and the KWIC document so that an appropriate location within the original document can be quickly referred from each KWIC representation in the abstract document. See page 4, [0074]. The KWIC representation is a proficient model for teaching a pan function for a user to visualize a different view of the existing document.

In reference to dependent claim 6 & 7, the reference to Ono teaches a browser utilized for the viewing of and manipulating of HTML documents. More specifically, the browser allows a user the ability to edit, resize, save, and perform other document functions. The examiner takes Official Notice that the use of a zoom function and enlarging a format were well-known browser options related to a document.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Ono teaches:

As illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to claims 9-10, 13-16, the claims recite the system for carrying out similar functions to the method claims found in 1, 2, 5-9. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 17, 18, 21-25, the claims recite the computer program product for carrying out similar functions to the method claims found in 1, 2, 5-9. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 26, Ono teaches:

Specific contents of the KWIC register, the header line register and the head line register, respectively, after processing all the lines. The first columns in figures 8-10 are the KWIC line number, the header line number and the head line number, respectively, and the second column is the line number within the original document of that line. See page 7, [0144].

In reference to dependent claim 28, Ono teaches:

The abstract created in the following description is a computerized document obtained by shortening the computerized document in order to grasp an outline of the acquired computerized document and comprises a title of the document. See page 3, [0067 through 0069].

In reference to dependent claim 29, Ono teaches:

When a keyword held in the keyword holding section is contained in part of the line other than the HTML tag part, a KWIC line counter is incremented to remove the tags contained in the line to extract as a KWIC line and to register in the KWIC line register. See page 4, [0088 through 0091].

In reference to dependent claim 30, Ono teaches:

Links are stretched and represented by changing a color of characters or by drawing an underline in representing that portion in the document. It is also possible to link to a button or a pattern called an icon within the document A. See page 3, [0058 through 0060].

In reference to dependent claim 31, Ono teaches:

As illustrated in figure 7, the KWIC representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to dependent claim 32, Ono teaches:

When a keyword held in the keyword holding section is contained in part of the line other than the HTML tag part, a KWIC line counter is incremented to remove the tags contained in the line to extract as a KWIC line and to register in the KWIC line register. See page 4, [0088 through 0091].

In reference to dependent claim 34, Ono teaches:

The abstract processing section reads a document to be abstracted as a pre-processing to unify character codes or to divide an extremely long line. While there exists JIS code, SJIS code and EUC code as Kanji codes used in Japanese computerized texts, they are translated appropriately to unify into any one of them. See page 4, [0076 through 0079].

In reference to dependent claim 35, Ono teaches:

When a keyword held in the keyword holding section is contained in part of the line other than the HTML tag part, a KWIC line counter is incremented to remove the tags contained in the line to extract as a KWIC line and to register in the KWIC line register. See page 4, [0088 through 0091].

In reference to dependent claim 36, Ono teaches:

Links are stretched and represented by changing a color of characters or by drawing an underline in representing that portion in the document. It is also possible to link to a button or a pattern called an icon within the document A. See page 3, [0058 through 0060].

In reference to dependent claim 37, Ono teaches:

As illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to dependent claim 38, Ono teaches:

When a keyword held in the keyword holding section is contained in part of the line other than the HTML tag part, a KWIC line counter is incremented to remove the tags contained in the line to extract as a KWIC line and to register in the KWIC line register. See page 4, [0088 through 0091].

In reference to claims 40-45, the claims recite the computer program product for carrying out similar instructions to those rejected in 1, 34-36. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 46, Ono teaches:

The system presents an adequate prompt or a screen display to obtain or retrieve a keyword from the user and registers it to the keyword holding section. The abstract creating system creates an abstract of each document by utilizing the keyword and the HTML document is presented. See page 8, [0171 through 0175].

In reference to dependent claim 47, Ono teaches:

The abstract creating system creates an abstract of each document by utilizing the keyword and the HTML document is presented. See page 8, [0171 through 0175].

In reference to claims 48 and 49, the claims recite a system for performing similar actions to those found in claims 46 and 47. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to claims 50 and 51, the claims recite the computer program product for carrying out similar actions to those found in claims 46 and 47. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, and 21-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant states on pages 11 through 14 that Ono detects a keyword in a KWIC document but Ono embeds a clickable link within an abstract document (whose likeness is different from the KWIC document's likeness). Furthermore, applicant states that by embedding its clickable link within the abstract document (whose likeness is different from the KWIC document likeness), Ono clearly teaches away from claim 1 because Ono fails to embed its clickable link at the location where Ono detects the keyword in the KWIC document. The examiner would like to point out the illustration of computerized document version found in figure 1. The figure illustrates the document storage section holds a computerized document to be retrieved and to be abstracted. An abstract document and KWIC document are created from the original document or version. As presently claimed, the language states, 'at a first location within the version'. The KWIC and abstract documents are interpreted as locations within the

version and both contain information extracted from the original version. The KWIC document provides a similar likeness to the original and embeds links within the version as well as a second location within the abstract document. The examiner proposes that the computerized document, the KWIC document, and the abstract document are displayed on a display device as a likeness of the paper. Without any further information related to the first location within the version or the second location, the examiner believes the reference to Ono provides sufficient language for a method of detecting keywords and creating documents with a likeness to the original with embedded links to allow a user access to various parts of the document.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML

Application/Control Number: 09/690,368
Art Unit: 2178

Page 11